

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**

2007-2008 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT

FOR:

Midwest Life Enhancement Services

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications	Satisfactory	Lesson matches original description	Below/Approaching Standard (1.5)	Criminal Background Checks	Non-compliance
Recruiting Materials	Satisfactory	Instruction is clear	Approaching Standard (2)	Health/safety laws & regulations	In Compliance
Academic Program	Satisfactory	Time on task is appropriate	Below/Approaching Standard (1.5)	Financial viability	In Compliance
Progress Reporting	Unsatisfactory	Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	Approaching Standard (2)		
Assessment and Individual Program Design	Unsatisfactory	Student/instructor ratio: 8:1 or less	Meeting Standard (3)		

ACTION NEEDED:

As of the 2008-2009 school year, Midwest Life Enhancement Services will no longer be providing SES programs to Indiana students.

On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Midwest Life Enhancement Services
REVIEWER: MC

DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED: 6/18/08

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Tutor qualifications	BOTH of the following: -Tutor resumes/applications (<u>all tutors</u>) -Documentation of professional development opportunities in which tutors have participated (i.e. sign-sheets, agendas, presentations, certificates of completion, etc.) <i>In addition to:</i> ONE of the following: -Tutor evaluations (<u>all tutors</u>) -Recruiting policy for tutors (<u>one copy</u>) -Sample tutor contract (<u>one copy</u>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tutor resumes Sample tutor application Sample tutor contract Professional development opportunities Certificates of completion 		X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application states that tutors will be certified teachers or will have degrees ranging from Bachelor's degrees to doctoral degrees. Resumes submitted indicate that two tutors are certified and three have college degrees but are not certified teachers. Professional development opportunities were participated in by tutors at their school; other tutor participated in outside professional development opportunities related to early childhood education.
Recruiting materials	TWO of the following: -Advertising or recruitment fliers -Incentives policy -Program description for parents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program flyers in English/Spanish Program description 		X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flyers reflect programming as described in the originally approved application. Program description is reflective of originally approved application.
	ONE of the following: -Lesson plan(s) for the observed tutoring session(s) and for each subject in which provider tutors <i>In addition to:</i> ONE of the following: -Specific connections to Indiana standards (cite exact IN standard to which lesson connects) -Description of connections to curriculum of EACH district the provider works with.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lesson plans for grades 1-5 Connections to Indiana standards 		X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lesson plans were submitted for grades 1-5. Lesson plans include detailed instructions for tutors, such as how to begin the lesson, steps to take throughout the lesson, and how to review concepts from the lesson. Lesson plans appeared to be generally grade-level appropriate. While lesson plans seemed appropriate, the lessons observed for the lower grades (grades 1-2) did not reflect lesson plans,

Academic Program					<p>as students primarily worked independently on worksheets or reading books with little instruction and little tutor interaction. Some lessons observed for older grades reflected lesson plans, while others still had students working primarily independently on worksheets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lesson plans submitted connect to Indiana academic standards.
Progress Reporting	<p>ALL of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Progress reports (see IDOE e-mail for details regarding the request for progress reports) -Timeline for sending progress reports -Documentation of reports sent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sample progress reports SES agreements Timeline for sending progress reports 	X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timeline for progress reporting indicates that progress reports are to be submitted twice monthly. One district indicated progress reports had been submitted in a timely manner. However, information provided by another district surveyed indicated that progress reports were frequently late and when turned in were incomplete or incorrect. Progress reports include all components required in progress report checklist. SES agreements sometimes had standards checked that were not reflected on the progress reports; progress reports sometimes had standards listed that were not checked on the SES agreement. SES agreements should match standards listed on progress reports.
Assessment and Individual Program Design	<p>ALL of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Explanation of the process provider uses to develop Individual learning plans for each student - Pre-assessment scores and Individual learning plan for at least one student in each subject provider tutors (any identifying information for the student(s) must be blanked out) -Explanation and evidence regarding how provider's pre and post-test assessment correlates to Indiana academic standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pre- and post-assessment scores Individual learning plans Connection to standards 	X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual learning plans include goals, strategies for attaining goals, and materials and equipment needed. Goals listed were standards; goals did not include information as to how progress would be measured, by how much students were expected to show growth or mastery of the standards listed, and by when goals were expected to be attained. Some students had goals/standards listed that did not match standards listed on the SES agreements for those students. One district reported that assessments were not always completed correctly, were sometimes posted incorrectly, and in some cases assessments were given at incorrect grade levels.

On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Midwest Life Enhancement Services
SITE: Harrison Hill Elementary School
TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): 4 tutors
NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 4

DATE: 3/25/08; 4/17/08
REVIEWERS: M.C., S.T.
TIME OF OBSERVATION: 4:15PM, 4:20PM

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving "1 or 2 points" on any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application		X			<p>In the first set of lessons observed (for lower grades), one group of students worked on worksheets while another group of students read from reading workbooks. In the first group, students primarily worked independently on worksheets. The tutor attempted to interact with them but often struggled to do so because of the size of the group. When the tutor interacted with the students, it was primarily to correct mistakes or answer questions. In the other group, students read their readers independently. When they finished the story they were working on, they were told to select another reading book. One student selected a book with math problems in it and began working with math. This group did not appear to be following a lesson plan.</p> <p>In the second set of lessons observed, one group worked with a tutor talking about identifying parts of a book and then began working on building a story web. Lesson seemed based on a lesson plan and was very organized. Two other groups worked with one tutor and again were working primarily independently on workbook pages. Workbook pages seemed randomly selected and did not appear to follow a pre-set or organized lesson plan. These lessons did not appear to be organized around objectives, nor were objectives for the workbook pages students were working on introduced. Workbook pages were not connected to any larger concepts. The third group worked largely without any tutor interaction; tutor interaction occurred primarily to ask whether students had questions or whether they had understood what they read.</p> <p>The originally approved application indicates that lessons will connect to students' learning styles and will incorporate cooperative learning and brain-based research. While</p>

					one of the lessons observed did appear to reflect some of these traits, several of the lessons included students simply working on worksheets or working independently with little tutor interaction other than to ask simple comprehension questions, to provide directions, or to answer student questions.
Instruction is clear		X			One tutor in the first group did try to provide students with examples of how what they were working on in their worksheets connected and provided some clear instruction. Another tutor in the second group also provided students with clear instruction and objectives. While a few instructors gave students clear guidelines and tried to help students connect what they were working on to broader concepts and tried to build on prior knowledge, several tutors appeared to randomly hand out worksheets to students to work on. These tutors did not appear to be working from lesson plans and did not provide students with clear guidelines as to why they were working on particular assignments or worksheets. When asked for lesson plans, some tutors in the first group were unable to produce plans. Additionally, in one of the groups, one student who appeared to be limited in English proficiency had been placed in a large group and did not appear to clearly understand what was expected. Instructors did not appear to have been provided with appropriate information for interacting with this student.
Time on task is appropriate		X			Students often struggled to stay on task, especially in the groups in which students were primarily working independently on workbook pages and worksheets. In these groups, students often got off task, whispered and talked to one another, and got up multiple times to wash hands, sharpen pencils, etc. Students often seemed bored and stared at the ceiling or at their papers without doing work. While one tutor working with younger students attempted to interact with all students, due to the nature of the lessons (independent work on worksheets) and the size of the groups, the tutor struggled to interact with all students in a manner that kept them on task. In the group in which students were being provided with direct instruction and the tutor was working closely with them, students remained on task and engaged.
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable		X			Instructors appeared to care very much about the students they were working with. A few instructors appeared to have fairly strong knowledge about the levels of the students in their groups. In addition, a few instructors appeared to follow lesson plans and appeared to have a clear understanding of how their lessons were supposed to be structured. However, several other instructors did not appear to follow lesson plans and instead seemed to randomly assign work for students to do without an understanding of lesson objectives or without helping students connect what they were working on to broader concepts or prior knowledge. Instructors in these groups did not appear knowledgeable about how to keep students on task and engaged in their lessons and often struggled in this area and in managing student behavior.
Student/instructor ratio: 8:1 or less Ratio matches that reported in original provider application			X		Ratios observed met or were below ratio approved in application.

On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric COMPLIANCE Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Midwest Life Enhancement Services
REVIEWER: MC

DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED: 6/18/08

The following information is rated “Compliance” (C) or “Non-Compliance” (N-C). Selected documentation listed for each component must be submitted as part of the site visit monitoring. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider’s organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.**

If a provider is deemed to be in non-compliance with any component for which evidence has been requested, the provider may be contacted and may be required to develop and submit a corrective action plan for getting into compliance within 7 calendar days. If the corrective action plan is not submitted, if the corrective action plan is inappropriate or insufficient, or if the corrective action plan is not implemented, the provider may be removed from the state-approved list.

COMPONENT	REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE USE ONLY)	C	N-C
Criminal background checks	ALL of the following: -Criminal background checks from an appropriate source for every tutor and any other employees working directly with children.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background checks were submitted for all employees. However, one background check was misspelled; two others were obtained by employees, not the provider, a violation of IDOE Policies & Procedures. 		X
Health and safety laws and regulations	ONE of the following: -Student release policy(ies) <i>In addition to:</i> ONE of the following: -Safety plans and/or records -Department of Health documentation of physical plant safety (if operating at a site other than a school) -Evacuation plans/policies (e.g., in case of fire, tornado, etc.) -Transportation policies (as applicable)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student release policy Discipline policy Letter to parents Emergency directives 	X	
Financial viability	ONE of the following: -Documentation of liability insurance coverage <i>In addition to:</i> ONE of the following: -Audited financial statements -Tax return for the past two years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of liability insurance 	X	